

## REMARKS

### I. Summary of the Office Action

Claims 40-49, 99-108, 153-162, and 168-177 are pending in this application. (Claims 1-39, 50-98, 109-152, and 163-167 were withdrawn from consideration.)

The Examiner objects to the specification for containing informalities.

The Examiner rejects claims 40-45, 49, 99-104, 108, and 159-162 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter regarded as the invention.

Claims 40-47, 49, 99-106, 153-160, and 162 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Croy et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,509,908 (hereinafter "Croy").\*

Claims 48, 107, 161, and 168-177 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious from Croy.

### II. Summary of Applicants' Reply

Applicants have amended the specification to update references to other patent applications to include

---

\* Applicants assume the Examiner intended to include claims 40-45 in the listing of claims anticipated by Croy because the Office Action includes reasons why claims 40-45 are anticipated by Croy (See Office Action, pp. 3-8).

application Nos. No new matter has been introduced as a result of these amendments.

Applicants have amended claim 159 to correct typographical errors. Applicants have canceled claims 40-45, 49, 99-104, 108, 153-158, 162, 168-173, and 177 without prejudice.

The Examiner's objection and rejections are respectfully traversed.

### III. Applicants' Reply to the Objection

The specification is objected to for containing informalities. Applicants have amended the specification to update references to other patent applications to include application Nos. This objection should therefore be withdrawn.

### IV. Applicants' Reply to the § 112 Rejection

Claims 40-45, 49, 99-104, 108, and 159-162 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter regarded as the invention. Applicants have canceled claims 40-45, 49, 99-104, 108, and 162, thereby rendering the rejection of those claims moot. Applicants have amended claim 159 to provide

antecedent basis for the term "user." This rejection should therefore be withdrawn.

V. Applicants' Reply to the § 102 Rejection

Claims 40-47, 49, 99-106, 108, 153-160, and 162 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Croy. Applicants have canceled claims 40-45, 49, 99-104, 108, 153-158, and 162, thereby rendering the rejection of those claims moot. This rejection is respectfully traversed with respect to remaining claims 46, 47, 105, 106, 159, and 160.

Applicants' invention, as defined by independent claims 46, 105, and 159, includes a local interactive television program guide implemented on interactive television program guide equipment and a remote access interactive television program guide implemented on a remote access program guide device, which communicate over a remote access link.

Croy discusses a remote device for monitoring and controlling electronic devices (e.g., TV, VCR, etc.), which receives information from a base unit. The remote device includes a display on which program listings may be displayed.

Applicants submit that Croy fails to show or suggest configuring a local interactive television program guide to record a television program selected by a user with the interactive television program guide equipment, as required by independent claims 46, 105, and 159.

Although it is not clear whether Croy discusses implementing a program guide on the base station (i.e., a local interactive television program guide), applicants submit that such a program guide would not be able to set a recording. In Croy, the only means of recording television programs is provided by a VCR, which receives television programs from the base station via the tuner. The base station does not communicate with the VCR in any other way, and is therefore not configured to set a recording on the VCR. Accordingly, a program guide implemented on the base station would be unable to set a recording on the VCR.

Instead, Croy discusses using the remote device to directly set recordings of programs on the VCR. The remote device communicates with the VCR using an infrared signal. "Remote device 200 emits well-known infrared coded signals to invoke [a] function in the VCR" (Croy, column 19, lines 61-63). Croy further states that "the remote device may ... program a VCR to record the specified program"

(Croy, column 17, lines 16-22). Therefore, the program guide implemented on the remote device is the only program guide configured to set a recording on the VCR. The remote device does not communicate with any guide on the base station to effect recording. Therefore, Croy fails to teach or suggest the required "*remote access interactive television program guide [that] is configured to provide the user with an opportunity to remotely select a program for recording by the local interactive television program guide over a remote access link.*"

Accordingly, Croy does not show or suggest configuring a local interactive television program guide to record a television program selected by a user with the interactive television program guide equipment.

For at least this reason, independent claims 46, 105, and 159 are not anticipated by Croy. Therefore, the rejection of independent claims 46, 105, and 159 and dependent claims 47, 106, and 160 over Croy should be withdrawn.

#### VI. Applicants' Reply to the § 103 Rejection

Claims 48, 107, 161, and 168-177 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious from Croy. Applicants have canceled claims 168-173 and 177, thereby

rendering the rejection of those claims moot. This rejection is respectfully traversed with respect to remaining claims 48, 107, 161, and 174-176.

Independent claims 46, 105, and 159 have been shown to be allowable over Croy. Therefore, dependent claims 48, 107, and 161, which depend from independent claims 46, 105, and 159, respectively, are also allowable over Croy.


The computer-readable medium of claims 174-176 corresponds to the method of claims 105-107. Because claims 105-107 have been shown to be allowable over Croy, claims 174-176 are also allowable over Croy.

Therefore, this rejection should be withdrawn.

VII. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, this application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Patrick J. Zhang", is written over a horizontal line.

Patrick J. Zhang  
Registration No. 52,394  
Agent for Applicants  
FISH & NEAVE LLP  
Customer No. 1473  
1251 Avenue of the Americas  
New York, New York 10020-1105  
Tel.: (212) 596-9000  
Fax: (212) 596-9090